

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended to incorporate the features of claim 2 and claim 2 is canceled.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Kang during the telephonic interview held January 11, 2007 are appreciated. The comments constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

Applicant appreciates the indication that claims 22-33 are allowable if rewritten in independent form. In view of the amendments and remarks presented herein, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-33 are allowable.

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Venkatraman et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,170,007 in view of Atozawa et al., JP 5153121. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The combination of Venkatraman and Atozawa fails to teach or suggest a network system having, in pertinent part, a plurality of terminals... and a controller having selecting means for selecting one of the plurality of terminals based on a user's designation. The Office Action indicates that Venkatraman teaches a network system comprising a plurality of terminals..., the controller comprising selecting means for selecting and controlling the plurality of terminals based on a user's designation..." (see page 2, item 3, first paragraph of the Office Action; emphasis added.) The feature that is being cited as taught by Venkatraman is not what is recited in claim 1. Specifically, the selecting means in the recited claims provides that any terminal, from a plurality of terminals, may be selected to obtain information on all the interconnected terminals. The Office Action appears to concede this point by stating "Venkatraman does not explicitly teach at least two of the terminals each adapted to obtain information on the other terminals therefrom..." (see page 2, item 3, second paragraph of the Office Action.)

Atazawa does not cure Venkatraman's deficiency. Atozawa appears to suggest an information collecting system within a network system in which specific nodes are assigned to collect information about other specific nodes. For example, in Fig. 1 of Atozawa, it appears that node 6g is wired to collect information from nodes 6d, 6e and 6f, while node 6i collects information directly from node 6h and indirectly from node 6c. Therefore, it does not appear that Atozawa discloses a system in which any terminal may be selected to collect information from all the interconnected terminals, and to specifically transmit to the controller information on all the interconnected terminals, as recited in the pending claims (see, e.g., claim 1). In fact, Atozawa discloses a system in which certain nodes or terminals are apparently pre-wired to collect information on other specified nodes or terminals.

Moreover, Atozawa's system performs the following steps according to Atozawa's paragraphs [0013] and [0014].

1. A managing node 6 transmits an inquiry packet 9 to node 6g.
2. The node 6g responds to the inquiry packet 9 and transmits an information packet 10 of "connecting with nodes 6d, 6e, and 6f" to the managing node 6.
3. The managing node 6 further responds to the reply from the node 6g and transmits, to the node 6g, an inquiry packet 9 including "instructions to relay to nodes 6d, 6e, and 6f."
4. The node 6g transfers the inquiry packet 9 to the nodes 6d, 6e, and 6f.
5. In response to the inquiry packet 9, each of the nodes 6d, 6e, and 6f transmits an information packet 10 to the node 6g.
6. The node 6g transmits, to the managing node 6, the information packets 10 transmitted from the nodes 6d, 6e, and 6f.

On the contrary, equivalent information can be collected by four steps in the claimed network system as below:

1. A controller (managing node) transmits a request for obtaining information on other terminals connected on the network to one terminal (node), among the terminals (nodes), which has been selected by a user's designation;

2. "The one terminal (node) selected" transmits the request to the other terminals on the network.
3. Each of "the other terminals" replies and transmits information to "the one selected terminal."
4. "The one terminal selected" transmits the information replied from "the other terminals" to the managing terminal.

A significant difference between Atozawa and the claimed network system is that when a controller (managing node) asks one terminal for "information on other terminals," the "other terminals" has not been designated in Step 1 as described above for the claimed network system, while the "other nodes" are designated in Step 3 in Atozawa as described above.

In view of the above, there combination of Venkatraman and Atozawa fails to teach or suggest the claim network system in which any terminal, from a plurality of terminals, may be selected to obtain information on all the interconnected terminals. Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-33 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Lynn E. Schwenning
Registration No. 37,233

JAO:LES/rle

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: January 11, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--